



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

BD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,326	08/29/2001	Timothy Roscoe	1589a	6834
28005	7590	02/07/2006	EXAMINER	
SPRINT			POLTORAK, PIOTR	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY				
KSOPHT0101-Z2100				
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

09/941,326

**Applicant(s)**

ROSCOE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Peter Poltorak

**Art Unit**

2134

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that none of the prior art teaches: "Providing at least a portion of the access-control logic to an interconnection system in response to an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component".

Applicant's arguments are not understood. For example, as per Pfleeger applicant suggests that the examiner "has not provided the required basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the examiner's position"; however applicant did not offer any specifics. Thus, it is unclear what did applicant not understand or what was contested.

Similarly, addressing Wiegel's invention applicant suggests that "the user can drag network security policies and drop them onto each icon in the network tree". It is not clear, how this particular argument offered by applicant relates to other quotes of Wiegel that address the limitations of the claims and are recited in the last Office Action by the examiner.

Due to the lack of understanding of "the required basis in fact and/or technical reasoning" presented by the examiner an additional attempt is made to clarify Pfleeger's teaching for applicant's convenience.

In Figure 9-33 Pfleeger discloses an interconnection system comprising multiple nodes residing at three locations (Pg. 429 and 430). A screening router controls traffic by sender and destination addresses as well as application and the application port number (using FTP, SMTP etc., pg. 430).

In other words Pfleeger accounts for at least an attempted communication between at least two nodes, which inherently involves at least one service component (see any textbook on principles of data and computer communications and/or principles of operating systems, e.g. Stallings, pg. 19-20). Pfleeger's explicitly teaches implementation of access control to nodes of the interconnection system: e.g. "a screening router on the LAN at 100.24.4.0 to allow in only communications destined to the host at 100.24.4.0, and allow out only communications addressed to address 144.27.5.3 or 192.19.33.0" (pg. 429) which clearly reads on "providing at least a portion of the access-control logic to an interconnection system".

Applicant failed to address the issues and as a result the arguments are unpersuasive.

Continuation of 13. Other: Reference Cited: Stallings (William Stallings, "Data and computer communications", 5th edition, 1997, ISBN: 0024154253), pg. 19-20.



KIM VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100